

(2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action is situated; or

(3) if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought as provided in this section, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court's personal jurisdiction with respect to such action.

28 U.S.C. § 1391(a).

The complaint shows that a transfer of the case to Maryland under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a) is appropriate. The complaint does not allege facts showing that the Southern District of Texas is a proper venue for the litigation under § 1391. None of the defendants is alleged to be a resident of the Southern District of Texas. The alleged events did not occur in Texas. All the defendants appear to be residents of, or entities in, Maryland, and the complaint alleges that the events at issue took place in Maryland.¹ (Docket Entry No. 1 at 3–9).

The court orders the parties to file written statements, each no longer than 5 pages, by **August 12, 2019**, to show cause why the case should not be transferred to the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland. The court will hear the issue at the conference set for **August 27, 2019, at 3:30 p.m.**

Because the initial conference was reset, the plaintiffs' motion for a continuance is denied. (Docket Entry No. 4).

SIGNED on July 16, 2019, at Houston, Texas.



Lee H. Rosenthal
Chief United States District Judge

¹ The complaint also includes a heading, "IN THE DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND," suggesting that the plaintiffs themselves may believe that Maryland is a proper venue for this litigation. (See Docket Entry No. 1 at 1).